

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1 and 15. These sheets, which include Figs. 1 and 15, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1 and 15.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 and 16-22 are presently pending in this application; Claims 15 has been canceled without prejudice; and Claims 1-14 and 16-22 are amended. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to because of informalities; the specification was objected to for informalities; Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9 and 19 were objected to for informalities; Claim 22 was objected to for being in improper form; Claims 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by WO 99/12349 (hereinafter "WO '349"); and Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over WO '349 in view of Hanson et al. (U.S. Patent 4,786,966).

First, the informalities identified in the specification are corrected herewith. No new matter is added.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, on the replacement sheets, Figures 1 and 15 are amended to address the informalities. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings is overcome.

Regarding the objection to the specification, the specification is amended as suggested in the outstanding Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the specification is overcome.

Regarding the objection to the claims, the claims are amended to address the informalities. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the claims is overcome.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome because, in Applicants' view, amended independent Claims 16 and 19 patentably distinguish over WO '349 as discussed below.

Claim 16 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, “a surrounding image receiving portion for receiving a surrounding video signal from each of a plurality of camera-equipped portable terminals,” “a variation detecting portion ... for detecting variation information corresponding to said each camera-equipped portable terminal having transmitted the surrounding video signal, based on the received surrounding video signal and the surrounding video signal stored in said previous frame memory corresponding to said each camera-equipped portable terminal having transmitted the surrounding video signal” and “a capturing signal generating portion ... for generating, from the detected variation information signal and the previously generated capturing signal of the user terminal identification information stored in the previously memory, a capturing signal to be used for capturing a video signal of a part of a panoramic object.”

Instead, WO ‘349 describes a plurality of user terminals which access a website and obtain a video image of a remote site. The user terminals send commands and/or queries to a remote camera device to control angles and positions of the image to be taken. WO ‘349 in Fig. 8A shows a system in which a 180 degree spherical view (panorama view) is captured by a remote camera 180, and the spherical video is sent to a website where users can access different portions of the spherical view.

However, WO ‘349 does not teach or suggest receiving a surrounding video signal from each of a plurality of camera-equipped portable terminals. Further, WO ‘349 does not teach or suggest generating a capturing signal for capturing a video signal of a part of a panoramic object from a previously generated capturing signal and a variation information signal, which is detected based on a received surrounding video signal and a surrounding video signal stored in a previous frame memory.

Thus, WO ‘349 fails to teach or suggest at least “a surrounding image receiving portion for receiving a surrounding video signal from each of a plurality of camera-equipped

portable terminals,” “a variation detecting portion ... for detecting variation information corresponding to said each camera-equipped portable terminal having transmitted the surrounding video signal, based on the received surrounding video signal and the surrounding video signal stored in said previous frame memory corresponding to said each camera-equipped portable terminal having transmitted the surrounding video signal” and “a capturing signal generating portion ... for generating, from the detected variation information signal and the previously generated capturing signal of the user terminal identification information stored in the previously memory, a capturing signal to be used for capturing a video signal of a part of a panoramic object,” as recited in Claim 16.

Similar arguments as those set forth above also apply to Claim 19.

Accordingly, independent Claims 16 and 19 patentably distinguish over WO '349. Since Claims 17, 18, 20 and 21 are dependent from respective Claims 16 and 19, substantially the same arguments set forth above also apply to these dependent claims. Therefore, Claims 16-21 are believed to be allowable.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome because, in Applicants' view, amended independent Claims 1, 2, 7, 13 and 14 patentably distinguish over WO '349 and Hanson et al. as discussed below.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “image sensing surroundings by a camera-equipped portable terminal at a position where a display on said image display portion can be seen, and sending a surrounding video signal to said image capturing device,” “obtaining variation information about surrounding image by a variation detecting portion in said image capturing device, based on a previous surrounding video signal and a current surrounding video signal received from said camera-equipped portable terminal,” “obtaining from said remote image sensing device a video signal of a part of said panoramic object changed corresponding to a

change of said surrounding image based on said variation information” and “sending said obtained video signal to said image display portion.”

The outstanding Office Action acknowledges that WO ‘349 does not disclose image sensing of surroundings by a camera-equipped portable terminal, sending the surrounding video signal to the image capturing device, obtaining variation information about the surrounding image from the camera-equipped portable terminal based on the previous video signal and the current video signal, and obtaining from the remote camera a video signal of part of the object changed based on the variation information. Instead, the outstanding Office Action relies on Hanson et al. to remedy the deficiencies.

Hanson et al. describes a head mounted video display and a remote camera system where a video signal produced by a remote video camera is sent and received by a video display mounted on a helmet. Hanson et al. in Fig. 3 shows that a surrounding image taken by a video camera 12 mounted on a helmet 40 is displayed on a display 14 which is also mounted on the helmet 40. Thus, the system disclosed in Hanson et al. uses only one camera. Hanson et al. does not teach anything about using the image on the display 14 for controlling image capture at a remote site (*e.g.*, obtaining a video signal of a part of a panoramic object changed corresponding to a change of the surrounding image based on variation information). In this regard, Hanson et al. in Fig. 1 shows that the camera 12 senses an image of an object 16 and transforms it into a video signal, which is supplied to a display 26 or a video display 14, where a viewer aligns the camera 12 with respect to a particular scene while observing the image on the display 26 or 14. However, the image sensed by the camera 12 is sent only to the display 26 and/or 14, and not used for controlling capture of a portion of image taken by any other camera.

In addition, Hanson et al. describes that a video display system is mounted on a helmet to assist a combat pilot in maneuvering aircraft and for weapon deployment. Hanson

et al. describes that a movement of the pilot's head (*i.e.*, the pilot's helmet) results in a corresponding movement of the weaponry. However, Hanson et al. does not teach using a captured surrounding image for detection of the movement of the helmet. That is, Hanson et al. does not teach using previous and current surrounding images obtained by a camera-equipped portable terminal to detect variation information, based on which a portion of an image is extracted from a panoramic image captured by a remote camera.

Thus, WO '349 and Hanson et al. fails to teach or suggest at least "image sensing surroundings by a camera-equipped portable terminal at a position where a display on said image display portion can be seen, and sending a surrounding video signal to said image capturing device," "obtaining variation information about surrounding image by a variation detecting portion in said image capturing device, based on a previous surrounding video signal and a current surrounding video signal received from said camera-equipped portable terminal," "obtaining from said remote image sensing device a video signal of a part of said panoramic object changed corresponding to a change of said surrounding image based on said variation information" and "sending said obtained video signal to said image display portion," as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over WO '349 and Hanson et al., and therefore is believed to be allowable.

Turning now to Claim 2, the outstanding Office Action acknowledges that WO '349 does not disclose receiving a surrounding video signal from a camera-equipped portable terminal (Office Action at page 12, lines 1-2). Instead, the outstanding Office Action relies on Hanson et al. to remedy the deficiency (Office Action at page 12, lines 2-4).

However, as discussed above, Hanson et al. only describes displaying an image of an object 16 on a display 26 or a video display 14. That is, the image sensed by the camera 12 is sent only to the display 26 and/or 14, but not to an image capturing device. In other words,

Hanson et al. does not teach or suggest an image capturing device including a surrounding image receiving portion for receiving an image signal from the camera 12. Therefore, Hanson et al. does not remedy the deficiency of WO '349.


Substantially the same arguments as set forth above also apply to independent Claims 7, 13 and 14.

Accordingly, independent Claims 2, 7, 13 and 14 patentably distinguish over WO '349 and Hanson et al. Since Claims 3-6 and 8-12 are dependent directly or indirectly from respective Claims 2 and 7, substantially the same arguments set forth above also apply to these dependent claims. Therefore, Claims 1-14 are believed to be allowable.

In view of the amendments and discussions presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early action favorable to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Richard D. Kelly
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 27,757

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Akihiro Yamazaki
Registration No. 46,155

RDK\AY\TY:pta
I:\ATTY\TYAMEND-RESPONSES\261163\261163 PROP RES DUE AUG 30 2007.DOC